

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Mundane constructs of the third and public sectors in the Finnish welfare state : A qualitative analysis of the gambling profit-based public grant system

Kankainen, Veera

2021-12-09

Kankainen , V , Lerkkanen , T & Hellman , M 2021 , ' Mundane constructs of the third and public sectors in the Finnish welfare state : A qualitative analysis of the gambling profit-based public grant system ' , Nordisk välfärdsforskning = Nordic Welfare Research , vol. 6 , no. 3 , pp. 180-191 . <https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2464-4161-2021-03-05>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/337962>

<https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2464-4161-2021-03-05>

cc_by_nc

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Mundane constructs of the third and public sectors in the Finnish welfare state

A qualitative analysis of the gambling profit-based public grant system

Veera Kankainen

Doctoral student, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland

veera.kankainen@helsinki.fi

Tuulia Lerkkanen

Doctoral student, Department of Public Health Sciences, Stockholm University, Sweden

tuulia.lerkkanen@su.se

Matilda Hellman

Research Director, Head of CEACG Research Unit, University of Helsinki, Finland

matilda.hellman@helsinki.fi

Abstract

This study analyses everyday value constructs pertaining to the Finnish gambling profit-based state grant system – an institution that channels proceeds from the state gambling monopoly to the third sector. Recently, various experts have questioned the system because of its connections to gambling. Using the concept of mundane reasoning, the article maps out everyday understandings of the system. The study analyses three datasets that represent different mundane arenas: focus group interviews with Finnish citizens, interviews with welfare-promoting third-sector organizations, and articles from the Finnish daily newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat*. The results show that mundane ideas strengthen the role of the public sector as a primary service provider and the third sector in adding value to it. The article concludes that the gambling profit-based grant system represents both universalism and particularism in mundane reasoning. The arguments provided are important in view of the current discussions about the roles of the third and public sectors in the Nordic welfare state.

Keywords

Welfare state, gambling, third sector, focus groups, media analysis, non-profit funding

Introduction

The welfare state and its institutions are redefined both in expert discourses (e.g. Hellman et al., 2017; Kantola & Kananen, 2013; Saarinen et al., 2014) and everyday constructs. The importance of everyday constructs about welfare state systems is evident in Birgit Pfau-Effinger's (2005) concept of welfare culture as collectively shared ideas regarding the welfare provision in any given society. This article unravels the ideas about the Finnish gambling profit-based state grant system that channels proceeds from the state gambling monopoly to various third-sector fields: social and healthcare associations, art and cultural organizations and activities, science projects, sports and physical exercise, and youth work. The sys-

tem has been an institutionalized source of state funding for the third sector but due to the introduction of the new gambling harm prevention measures, profits are predicted to decrease during the 2020s (Veikkaus Oy, 2019). Recently, officials have suggested transferring the gambling revenue to the state budget (e.g. Liikanen et al., 2021; Pöyry & Maliranta, 2021). This study asks how the grant system is constructed in mundane reasoning in relation to the Finnish welfare culture.

Everyday constructs are understood here as mundane reasoning, namely values and logics reproduced in everyday cultural arenas such as interactions between citizens, unofficial communication inside organizations, and reporting in news media (Hellman & Alanko, 2021; Törrönen 2000). The study analyses three datasets representing these mundane arenas: focus group interviews conducted with Finnish citizens, interviews with welfare-promoting third-sector organizations, and articles from the most popular Finnish newspaper, *Helsingin Sanomat*.

The three datasets also provide insights into mundane references to the welfare state's sectorial role division among citizens, the third sector and in the mass media. The Nordic welfare model has valued the extensive role of the public sector in welfare production, but from the outset, various governmental models and ideologies have produced complexity with regard to the current ideals. A certain complexity also characterizes the current role of organized civil society, referred to here as the third sector (Zimmer & Freise, 2008).¹ In this complexity, the qualitative studies addressing the constructs of both the third sector and the welfare state in the different communications remain topical.

Background

Birgit Pfau-Effinger (2005) has emphasized the importance of studying welfare culture, namely collective ideas such as “the stock of knowledge, values and ideals to which the relevant social actors, the institutions of the welfare state and concrete policy measures refer” (Pfau-Effinger, 2005, p. 4). Recently, Hellman and Alanko (2021) have suggested ways in which the welfare culture is reproduced throughout all levels of the Finnish welfare state system: in the principles of democratic governance, in different systems of service provision, and at the level of welfare professions. The gambling revenue-based grant system pertains to all of these levels, and the system is connected both to the welfare state's obligation to regulate harmful consumption (gambling) and to state/third-sector relations in the welfare provision (state grants channelled to third-sector activities that contribute to welfare).

The prevention and reduction of gambling related harm and crime are the formal goals of the Finnish act on gambling, called the Lotteries Act. They are also the juridical justifications for upholding a monopoly in the European Union; funding the third sector from the monopoly proceeds is not a valid justification in itself but only a by-product (Marionneau, 2015). Nevertheless, the Lotteries Act earmarks the proceeds from the Finnish state-owned gambling monopoly company – Veikkaus – to various third-sector fields and, therefore, upholds the connection between the gambling provision system and the third sector.

The proceeds are channelled via three ministries in the form of state grants. The Lotteries Act lays down the benefitting fields, the ministries, and the percentages according to which the profit is divided: 53% is directed to the Ministry of Education and Culture. From this pool, 38.5% is reserved for the funding of arts and cultural activities, 25% is channelled

1. Some Finnish associations engage in commercial and governmental activities but may still receive gambling profit-based grants for their non-profit and non-governmental activities. Therefore, this article uses the concept of third sector instead of non-profit or non-governmental organizations as it includes all types of associations.

into sport and physical activity, 17% is earmarked for science, and 9% for youth work. From the total profit, 43% is channelled to the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health to fund third-sector organizations working in the field of social and health care. The remaining 4% of the money goes to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry for the promotion of horse breeding and trotting. (Lotteries Act 1047/2001, 2002.)

The percentages in the Lotteries Act reflect the market shares of the three prior monopoly operators (Veikkaus, RAY, and Fintoto), which merged in 2017. Prior to that, the state-owned company Veikkaus (est. 1940) had a monopoly on lotteries and sports betting, and its proceeds were channelled to the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Finnish Slot Machine Association (in Finnish: RAY, est. 1938) was an association whose members comprised third-sector social and health care organizations. RAY had a grant department, which moved to the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health after the merger.

The merged monopoly has produced over one billion euros of non-profit funding annually (Ministry of Finance, 2021), which is estimated to cover one-third of all grants provided by the Finnish government offices (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017). Nevertheless, the gambling revenue is expected to drop by 100–150 million euros annually during the 2020s due to more effective harm prevention measures (Veikkaus Oy, 2019).

The tension between economic gains and public health goals is prevalent in gambling systems across different welfare state regimes (Egerer, Marionneau, & Nikkinen, 2018; Sulkunen et al., 2018). Historically, the Finnish gambling profit-based grant system was founded upon nationalistic and protectionist ideas of the public good (Matilainen, 2009). Recently, gambling researchers have sought to redefine the concept of the public good or the common good (for a conceptual discussion, see Järvinen-Tassopoulos & Eräsaari, 2018) with a view to creating greater coherence in light of overall harm prevention (Nikkinen & Marionneau, 2014; Sulkunen, 2018).

The data analysed in this study represents mundane reasoning on the Finnish gambling system. This reasoning can be seen as “cultural resources of thinking and argumentation that are (re)produced in everyday interaction, in media arenas, or in ‘unofficial speech cultures’ of institutions” (Törrönen, 2000, p. 139). The word mundane carries negative connotations, such as dull, but this study emphasizes that mundane ideas are an essential part of the welfare state discourses (see Törrönen, 2000, pp. 142–143). The welfare state has relied on mundane reasoning for its existence and this reasoning, in turn, supports citizens’ system literacy and notions of the societies of which they are a part (Hellman & Alanko, 2021). Mundane reasoning gathers traits and types of information into more or less logical entities (Pollner, 2010): knowledge, values, and ideals comprising the welfare culture may be logically coherent or incompatible (Pfau-Effinger, 2005). The research task here is to unfold how such ideas are reproduced in our materials. Hence, the research question is: How is the gambling profit-based grant system constructed in mundane reasoning in relation to the Finnish welfare culture?

Data and methods

This study practises data triangulation (Carter et al., 2014) in the sense that it brings together research materials representing three types of mundane reasoning. The materials were collected for three separate research projects, which concerned citizens’, third sector and media representations of the Finnish gambling policy system. Previous publications on the projects have focused on media representations of gambling, the public image of the Finnish gambling monopoly, and beneficiaries’ views on the acceptance of gambling-based

funding (see Egerer, Kankainen, & Hellman, 2018; Egerer, Alanko, et al., 2018; Lerkkanen et al., 2020; Lerkkanen, 2019; Lerkkanen & Marionneau, 2019; Marionneau & Kankainen 2018; Selin et al., 2019). The collection of each data set included the theme of the gambling-based grant system. In the analysis of this theme, we came to realize that a great dilemma pertained to the welfare state and its division of sectorial roles. Thus, the research question in this article could have been analysed for each dataset separately, but bringing different datasets together enables us to identify constructs that are common for different arenas of welfare-related discourse. In addition, when the data sets are analysed together, possible tensions can be observed on a more principle level: For example, citizens and the media can be freer to criticize the system than third-sector organizations that have vested interests.

The first dataset consists of focus groups interviews (n=19) conducted with a total of 88 participants (43 women, 45 men) in the Helsinki region in the winter of 2017–2018. The interviewees were recruited among participants in a representative gambling prevalence and harm survey, who had given their consent to be included in follow-up studies (see Salonen et al. 2017; 2019). Prior to the data collection, an approval statement for this method was acquired from the Ethical Review Board of the University of Helsinki. The interview protocol included six thematic sections (see Lerkkanen et al.; 2020), of which the parts that concerned the gambling profit funding were chosen for this study. As a stimulus for the group discussions, the participants were asked to assess the pros and cons of two optional models for distributing gambling revenues: one was a non-earmarked merging of gambling revenues with the general state budget, and the other entailed private gambling companies deciding on the profit division for beneficiaries. When it came to possible beneficiaries, the interviewees discussed a list of existing and potential profit-funding targets (e.g. youth associations, elite sports, or religious and political groups).

The second dataset comprises 20 semi-structured thematic interviews with representatives of third-sector organizations conducted with a total of 38 participants in 2015–2017. Half of the interviews were conducted with two to four participants from the same organization and the rest with one participant. All interviewees had practical knowledge of the grant-funding systems. Eight of the participating organizations had extensive experience of receiving funding from the Ministry of Education and Culture, twelve from the STEA grant department of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (and its predecessor, the grant department of RAY). The interview protocol included questions about applying for and reporting the grants, the pros and cons of state funding, and the position of the third sector as a beneficiary of gambling.

The data management followed the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity guidelines. All of the interview materials were recorded and transcribed with the permission of the participants, and all transcriptions were anonymized. The data were stored in the password-secured files at the University of Helsinki.

The third dataset consists of mass media items (n=117) published in the biggest Finnish mainstream daily, *Helsingin Sanomat*, between the years 2010 and 2016. The media material includes columns, editorials, news reports, and opinion pieces. The corpus of texts selected for this study all discuss the gambling proceeds and their allocation, such as how gambling revenues are or should be distributed and the amounts that different beneficiaries have received.

In order to identify the ideas embedded in the mundane reasoning on the grant system, an analytical framework was created based on Lubomír Doležel's modality theory (1998). The framework focuses on the deontic modality, indicating shared values or norms. Through the marking of what is thought as normatively right or wrong, the text [tran-

scribed interviews and media texts] creates notions of obligations, their violations, and the conflicts between them. For example, an utterance can construe both an obligation of the state and a violation of this obligation at the same time: “If the third sector is the only safety net for marginalized communities [premise/hypothetical situation], the welfare state has failed to take care all of its citizens [obligation that is being violated].” Obligation conflicts can entail contradictions or dilemmas, for example when the state’s interference in civil society is both required and denied: “The state must guarantee funding for the third-sector services, but it must not interfere with the autonomy of civil society.” Both of the above examples position different sectors in the production of welfare. References to sectoral roles turned out to be the dimension in which all three material communicated normative views on the Finnish welfare state.

In our analytical proceedings, we first identified the parts of the data describing different societal actors (state, third-sector organizations, gambling operators, etc.). We then proceeded to discern the obligations, violations, and conflicts (the deontic modality) that were referred to in their relational setup. This allowed us to identify values and logics according to which different actors were expected to operate and become part of the welfare state.

Results

By interpreting the data through our analytical framework, we have identified two obligations and their violations in all three datasets. The first obligation concerns expectations about the gambling revenue-based grant system’s ability to produce additional activities and services for the Finnish welfare state. The violation of the added-value obligation concerns channelling of gambling proceeds to the service provision that the public sector is construed to have responsibility for. The second obligation is that the system should benefit the Finnish national culture and welfare. This obligation is violated if private companies benefit from Finnish gambling. In addition, we have identified two conflicts that we call dependency and accountability dilemmas. The former relates to the citizen interviewees’ speculations on whether the state or civil society is the most trustworthy recipient of the gambling proceeds, and thus the most crucial executor and representative of the public (good). The second dilemma is identified in the newspaper material, which questions the dependence of third-sector government funding on gambling revenues.

Obligations

Bringing added value to the Finnish welfare state

The three datasets construed the grant system as a promoter of voluntary, flexible, and bottom-up solutions to social problems. The media reporting drew parallels between the third and public sector in producing welfare in Finnish society. For instance, a news article published in April 2012 reported how third-sector organizations regard the gambling monopoly as justified because the gambling revenues are channelled into “decreasing inequality and increasing well-being”. The grant system is thus seen as participating in working towards the core values of the welfare state.

The third sector interviewees expressed a more pronounced distinction between public sector services and activities funded with the grants. For example, according to one interviewee: “the resources gained through taxes, which are steered by the state and the municipality, start off as the will of the government”, but the money channelled to the third sector from gambling profits “starts off as the will of the people” (third-sector interview 9). Here, the grant-funded activities are construed as bottom-up solutions, whereas the tax-funded

services as top-down governance. Another third sector interviewee framed their organization's grant-funded activities as supplementing the public sector and stated that without the grant system, their association "could not support the people in the margins for whom the basic services are not sufficient. This is important association-based work close to the people" (third-sector interview 25). Basic services refers here to the services that the public sector has a legal obligation to produce. The work provided by the gambling profits is not regarded as a replacement for tax-funded basic services, but as an addition to them.

The focus group interviewees expressed similar ideas about the third sector having parallel obligations to the welfare state. They contemplated whether the third sector could handle some obligations better. For example, they figured that the gambling profit-funded third sector could ideally function more flexibly and rapidly than the public sector when resolving social problems. Their main view on the funding system was that the proceeds from the gambling monopoly should be considered "extra" money for the public good, and should not cover the infrastructure and basic needs that the public sector should be held accountable for.

Benefitting the Finnish nation

The idea of an obligation to produce the common good relies on the traditionalist and nationalistic ideal of a unitary Finnish society, whereby the gambling revenue ought to be of cultural or economic benefit. This nationalistic tone stood out the most in the media material in discussion about the funding of arts and sports. For example, a Finnish author expressed in an opinion piece that "despite their social work, the Finnish gambling operators also uphold the national culture" (Kupiainen, 2013). In another opinion piece, state secretary Marcus Rantala (2011) described the beneficiaries as being important for Finnish society:

The system is built on the basis of the needs of Finnish society and it is shaped to fit our culture. The system has proved to be reliable. From the perspective of the societal significance of culture, sports and youth work, it is important to maintain the funding of the beneficiaries of Veikkaus on the present basis (Rantala, 2011)

The expression "our culture" connotes a unitary Finnish society that stands to benefit from the gambling revenue. The extract maintains that the profit division is "reliable", without any further elaboration. Similar steadfast trust emerged in the focus group interviews, where the current third-sector funding system was seen as reliable simply due to its established and institutionalized nature. One focus group interviewee expressed the view that people ought to believe that the current system is "rational" and "good". Again, the mere fact that it exists was seen as giving credence to the system as a thought-through structure in Finnish society. The media materials and the third-sector interviewees construed the gambling profits and their funding targets as economically necessary. For example, the former communications director of Veikkaus, Ilkka Juva (2014), emphasized "the economic significance of legal gambling for Finnish citizens" and claimed that "the gambling revenue touches every citizen in some way". In another piece, the representatives of the beneficiaries, cultural influencer and politician Irina Krohn and lobbyist Petri Lahesmaa (2013), claimed that the significance of Veikkaus's revenue in supporting the development of Finnish civil society was indisputable. They believed that in an economic crisis, "it is impossible to imagine that a similar amount of money could be extracted from the regular state budget". Similarly, a third-sector interviewee stated that "it would be very unlikely" that the

state budget would ever cover the grants to the current extent (third-sector interview 4). The third-sector interviewees also linked the obligation of producing additional welfare for marginalized groups with the idea of benefitting Finnish society as a whole. For example, one interviewee mentioned how their organization helped both “ordinary families” and “families with complex problems”, saving public resources by preventing young people from “ending up in care” (third-sector interview 12).

Violations of Obligations

Funding basic services from the gambling proceeds

In all three datasets, the gambling revenue-based grant system is strictly demarcated as having a bottom-up supplemental role in view of the basic services provided by the public sector in the welfare state. Channelling the proceeds into activities classified as basic services or infrastructure was seen as a violation of this obligation. For example, both the interviewed citizens and the third-sector representatives regarded war veterans, libraries, and air ambulances as unsuitable objects for gambling revenue funding. These services were firmly situated in the scope of the welfare state’s basic obligations to be covered by public means. In the words of a participant in the focus groups:

Woman 1: [...] the money that Veikkaus is channelling is something extra that is allocated to competitive sports, for instance, which is not something that the state should take care of.

Man 1: A while ago, there was a discussion about whether Veikkaus could support libraries, and the conclusion was that it couldn’t because libraries belong to the municipalities, and they have to take care of some basic services without Veikkaus money.

The media material reported on cases where the revenue had been transferred to the state budget. In response to the transfer, an editorial described beneficiaries as being “shocked” and criticized the state for violating the consensus regarding the distribution of gambling proceeds, saying that it “jeopardized the generally approved model” (“Pelirahan uusi jako vaarantaa järjestötyötä”, 2012). The gambling profit-based grant system was depicted as a contract in which certain premises were inscribed. These were evident in the reasoning surrounding the ideal coverage of services by public means on the one hand, and by the grant-subsidized third sector on the other. In the media text cited above, concern was expressed with regard to whether the government’s decision would lead to the wider use of gambling proceeds to finance statutory social and health measures, duly dismantling the welfare state in the process.

The role of the for-profit sector

The third-sector interviewees regarded foreign gambling operators as unsuitable beneficiaries of gambling proceeds as they would not benefit Finnish society. The focus group interviewees were also suspicious of the national commercial gambling monopoly operator. When asked to assess a hypothetical subsidizing model in which for-profit companies would allocate grants, the interviewees questioned the ability of companies to guarantee universal welfare provision, as well as the model’s prospects to provide a sound and democratic governance of the grants. For example, one focus group interviewee suspected that the companies would allocate the grants only to the most powerful or popular applicant. The interviewee provides an example of a situation where public funds are distributed on the basis of popularity:

Man 2: [...] *Helsingin Sanomat* reported on a little 8-year-old boy who was not able to receive medical treatment because the public budget couldn't cover the million euros needed. [...] a few days after *Helsingin Sanomat* brought up the case, money emerged (for the treatment) but the article didn't say where the money was taken from. Was it from elderly care or somewhere else? If the gambling company allocated it (grants), this same phenomenon could emerge: the cutest cause would get the money.

Conflicts of obligations

Accountability dilemma: citizens' reflections on the public good

The focus group interviewees expressed suspicion towards possible beneficiaries representing political or religious movements. The reason for such suspicion could be that these actors are seen to represent particular interests and are not considered to represent Finnish society as a whole and on a general level. The interviewees provided contradictory assessments as to whether the state or the third sector was more reliable in defining the content of the public good. Some interviewees saw that if the proceeds were to be merged with the state budget as non-earmarked revenue, the political decision-makers could not be trusted to serve the universal interests of the citizens: "The state would not be forced to use the gambling proceeds for something beneficial. Alternatively, it would mean that the state would determine what is actually beneficial." (Man 4, focus group interview). In other reasoning contexts, the state was considered more reliable than the third sector. If the state budget were to be the only beneficiary of the gambling revenue, the interviewees speculated that this model might warrant the survival of those third-sector organizations that truly deserve their share of public funding: "In most cases, I trust the state more. But of course it is important for civil society to be able to conduct their activities. But I assume that they would also get their share from the state budget then." (Man 3, focus group interview).

Based on the materials analysed for this study, it remained inconclusive as to whether the state or civil society represents the public good. For the focus group interviewees, the current gambling revenue division system was seen to guarantee added value in public welfare provision. One participant pondered that if the proceeds were channelled to causes chosen by politicians and citizens, it was possible that "some important things that are taken care of by civil society" would be forgotten (Man 5, focus group interview).

Dependency dilemma: Are the gambling revenue-based grants the only form of state funding?

The dependency of the third sector on state funding that stems from gambling was criticized in the media material. For example, Teija Sutinen, a *Helsingin Sanomat* (2014) editor, stated that many artists would suffer without "the lottery people". Similarly, in an editorial, the well-being of many marginalized groups was described as directly dependent upon the gambling proceeds ("Pelirahan uusi jako vaarantaa järjestötyötä", 2012). However, there was little discussion of any alternative forms of (state) funding. Overall, state funding was not framed as a threat to the autonomy of civil society, but rather was criticized for being insufficient. For example, a long-term third-sector professional, Riitta Särkelä, called for the extension of state funding to cover more areas of civil society: "The work by organizations to promote well-being and health cannot succeed without money. It cannot be funded only with gambling revenue. Most local associations are not and will never be within its scope" (Särkelä, 2016b).

Discussion and conclusions

This study draws three conclusions: First, the mundane reasoning represented in the three materials under study supports a traditional Nordic sectorial role division in which the public sector is mainly held responsible for welfare service provision. In comparison to other countries, the Nordic civil societies have not held a primary role in this respect (Alapuro & Stenius, 2010). Throughout the datasets, the public sector was construed as being in charge of service provision and the third-sector services were seen to bring about an added supplement of well-being and welfare. Overall, views on this role division varies in different contexts. While political discourse has had a tendency to emphasize the importance of the third sector (Julkunen, 2000; Matthies, 2006), the actual changes made to the governmental structures and service arrangements have often favoured for-profit suppliers (Särkelä, 2016a; Selle & Strømsnes, 2019). Meanwhile, attitude surveys have indicated broad citizen support for public-sector services (Blomberg & Kroll, 2017). The citizens interviewed for this study also expressed hesitance with regard to for-profit companies' ability to provide welfare and equality.

The second conclusion is that the mundane justifications for the grant system involve nationalistic and protectionist ideas regarding economic gains and a common good that benefits Finnish society as a whole. Even among the Nordic countries, the Finnish political culture has been described as exceptionally oriented towards the nation-state: associations and political projects from left to right have had a strong imperative to ensure that they promote the interest of the Finnish nation-state (Stenius, 2010). From the perspective of the grant system, the combination of nationalistic and additional welfare promotion norms brings together two conflicting expectations as to what or whom the system ought to represent. On the one hand, the system is constructed to represent all citizens and the general (national and economic) interests of society. On the other hand, the system is understood to take into account groups and individuals in need of special help and beyond the reach of public basic services. Thus, the system is expected to embody both universalism and particularism.

The third conclusion is that the state funding of the Finnish third sector was regarded as legitimate throughout the data. The result might not be surprising in the case of the third sector organizations, which have their own vested interests in the matter, but the other datasets point in the same direction. The newspaper material included questioning about gambling revenue as a source of public funding, but the state funding of the non-profit sector was not questioned *per se*. For the citizens participating in the focus groups, the current gambling system appeared to be sound and accountable as it was seen to bring together the best parts of both the public sector and civil society. Whereas in the Anglo-American contexts the state and civil society relationships are oppositional and conflictual, the Nordic state-civil society models have been co-operative and consensus-oriented (Alapuro & Stenius, 2010; Enjolras & Strømsnes, 2018). In line with the latter model's co-operative setup, state funding for the third sector has been seen in a positive light (see also Trägårdh, 2010). The present study's positive mundane constructs may reflect this co-operative notion of state/third-sector relations. On the other hand, the consensus-orientation of everyday reasoning, especially in the focus group interviews, may have hampered the critical debates on the dependence of the third-sector funding on gambling revenues.

A limitation of the present study can be seen in the fact that the conflicting ideas – here referred to as dilemmas – were identified only in certain datasets, which may indicate that they were just emerging during the time the data represents, which is the early and mid-2010s. With the rise of more broad criticism of the grant system (e.g. Egerer, Kankainen, &

Hellman, 2018; Liikanen et al., 2021; Pöyry & Maliranta, 2021), more recent data could perhaps provide new obligations and conflicts. The selection of interviewees and parts of material (about the grant system) may also have resulted in an exclusion of more nuanced or alternative viewpoints. However, the main logic in the mundane reasoning represented the three sets of material was prevalent throughout and strengthens our view of the results as robust and valid.

In the years 2020 and 2021, public discussions have frequently suggested that there is a need for a redirecting of the gambling proceeds to the overall state budget. As the state budget option has started to crop up frequently in different arenas and the gambling revenue is expected to drop over time, the system and the sectoral role divisions of the welfare state will be a topic of debate in the coming decade. This study can help decision-makers and the public understand the main logics and dilemmas at stake.

References

- Alapuro, R., & Stenius, H. (2010). *Nordic Associations in a European Perspective*. Baden-Baden: Nomos. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845225944>
- Blomberg, H., & Kroll, C. (2017). Hyvinvointipolitiikan kannatus. In J. Kananen (Ed.), *Kilpailuvaltion kyydissä: Suomen hyvinvointimallin tulevaisuus*. (pp. 128–144). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The Use of Triangulation in Qualitative Research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545–547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.onf.545-547>
- Doležel, L. (1998). Possible Worlds of Fiction and History. *New Literary History*, 29(4), 785–809. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20057512>
- Egerer, M., Alanko, A., Hellman, M., Järvinen-Tassopoulos, J., Koivula, P., & Lerkkanen, T. (2018). *Rahapelitarjonnan tehtävä ja julkisuuskuva Suomessa: Haastattelututkimus rahapelipoliittisista mielipiteistä*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences.
- Egerer, M., Kankainen, V., & Hellman, M. (2018). Compromising the public good? Civil society as beneficiary of gambling revenue. *Journal of Civil Society*, 14(3), 207–221. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2018.1496306>
- Egerer, M., Marionneau, V., & Nikkinen, J. (Eds.). (2018). *Gambling Policies in European Welfare States: Current Challenges and Future Prospects*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90620-1>
- Enjolras, B., & Strømsnes, K. (2018). The Transformations of the Scandinavian Voluntary Sector. In B. Enjolras & K. Strømsnes (Eds.), *Scandinavian Civil Society and Social Transformations: The Case of Norway* (pp. 1–24). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Hellman, M., & Alanko, A. (2021). System level resilience: The role of welfare state accountability. In K. Ilmonen (Ed.), *The Political Analyst's Field Guide to Finland – Vulnerability and Resilience*. Forthcoming in publication series of University of Jyväskylä.
- Hellman, C. M. E., Monni, M., & Alanko, A. M. (2017). *Declaring, shepherding, managing: The welfare state ethos in Finnish government programmes, 1950–2015*. 10(1), 9–22.
- Järvinen-Tassopoulos, J., & Eräsaari, R. (2018). Conceptions of the Common Good. In M. Egerer, V. Marionneau, & J. Nikkinen (Eds.), *Gambling Policies in European Welfare States: Current Challenges and Future Prospects* (pp. 259–274). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90620-1_14
- Julkunen, R. (2000). Social Background of the Rise of the Third Sector. The Finnish Welfare Reform in the 1990s. In M. Siisiäinen, P. Kinnunen, & E. Hietanen (Eds.), *The third sector in Finland: Review to research of the Finnish third sector* (pp. 52–69). Helsinki: Sosiaaliturvan keskusliitto. Finnish Federation for Social Welfare and Health.
- Juva, I. (2014, March 31). Hallitus voisi valistaa rahapelien tuoton käytöstä. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://www.hs.fi/mielipide/art-2000002720599.html>

- Kantola, A., & Kananen, J. (2013). Seize the Moment: Financial Crisis and the Making of the Finnish Competition State. *New Political Economy*, 18(6), 811–826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2012.753044>
- Krohn, I., & Lahesmaa, P. (2013, May 21). Suomalainen pelimalli kestää vertailun. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://www.hs.fi/mielipide/art-2000002640027.html>
- Kupiainen, A. (2013, May 19). Rahapelimonopoli säilykseen. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://www.hs.fi/mielipide/art-2000002639676.html>
- Lerkkanen, T. (2019). *Monopolin puolustusta, kritiikkiä ja murtumisen uhkakuvia: Rahapelaamisen mediarepresentaatiot Helsingin Sanomissa vuosina 1990–2016* [University of Tampere]. <https://trepo.tuni.fi/handle/10024/105204>
- Lerkkanen, T., Egerer, M., Alanko, A., Järvinen-Tassopoulos, J., & Hellman, M. (2020). Citizens' Perceptions of Gambling Regulation Systems: A New Meaning-Based Approach. *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 43, pp. 84–101. doi: [10.4309/jgi.2020.43.6](https://doi.org/10.4309/jgi.2020.43.6)
- Lerkkanen, T., & Marionneau, V. (2019). Rahapelaaminen Helsingin Sanomissa vuosina 1990–2018. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka*, 84(5–6), 609–617.
- Liikanen, E., Hyssälä, L., Kivistö, K., Soininvaara, O., Wideroos, U.-M., & Pekkarinen, T. (2021). *The Finnish gambling system in transition: Options for the future* (2021:12). Helsinki: Finnish Government. Lotteries Act 2002 (1047/2001). Retrieved from <https://finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2001/20011047>
- Marionneau, V. (2015). Justifications of national gambling policies in France and Finland. *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 32(3), 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nsad-2015-0027>
- Marionneau, V., & Kankainen, V. (2018). Beneficiaries of gambling and moral disengagement. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 38(7–8), 578–591. doi: [10.1108/IJSSP-01-2018-0005](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-01-2018-0005)
- Matilainen, R. (2009). A question of money? The founding of two Finnish gambling monopolies. In S. Kingma (Ed.), *Global Gambling: Cultural Perspectives on Gambling Organizations* (pp. 21–37). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203870396>
- Matthies, A.-L. (2006). *Nordic Civic Society Organisations and the Future of Welfare Services: A Model for Europe?* Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers. <https://doi.org/10.6027/TN2006-517>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2017). *Preliminary study on the digitalisation of the government subsidy process* (No. 46/2017). Helsinki: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Ministry of Finance. (2021). *Valtion talousarvioesitykset*. Retrieved from <https://budjetti.vm.fi/indox/index.jsp>
- Nikkinen, J., & Marionneau, V. (2014). Gambling and the common good. *Gambling Research*, 26(1), 3–19.
- Pelirahan uusi jako vaarantaa järjestötyötä. (2012, April 6). *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://www.hs.fi/paakirjoitukset/art-2000002525647.html>
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2005). Culture and Welfare State Policies: Reflections on a Complex Interrelation. *Journal of Social Policy*, 34(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279404008232>
- Pollner, M. (2010). *Mundane Reason: Reality in Everyday and Sociological Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pöyry, L., & Maliranta, M. (2021). *Rahapelipoliittisen ohjausjärjestelmän nykytila ja muutos – tavoitteiden asettamisesta toteutukseen ja seurantaan* (No. 3/2021). Helsinki: KKV Kilpailu- ja kuluttajavirasto.
- Rantala, M. (2011, March 30). Veikkausvoittovarat kulttuuriin ja liikuntaan. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://www.hs.fi/mielipide/art-2000004797187.html>
- Saariainen, A., Salmenniemi, S., & Keränen, H. (2014). Hyvinvointivaltioista hyvinvoivaan valtioon. Hyvinvointi ja kansalaisuus suomalaisessa poliittisessä diskurssissa. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka*, 79(6), 605–618.
- Salonen, A., Lind, K., Castrén, S., Lahdenkari, M., Kontto, J., Selin, J., Hellman, M. & Järvinen-Tassopoulos, J. (2019). *Rahapelaaminen, rahapelihaitat ja rahapelien markkinointiin liittyvät mielipiteet kolmessa maakunnassa* (No. 4/2019). Helsinki: National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL).
- Salonen, A., Latvala, T., Castren, S., Selin, J., & Hellman, M. (2017). *Rahapelikysely 2016: Rahapelaaminen, rahapelihaitat ja rahapelien markkinointiin liittyvät mielipiteet Uudenmaalla, Pirkanmaalla ja Kymenlaaksossa* (No. 9/2017). Helsinki: THL. Retrieved from THL website: <https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/230209>

- Särkelä, R. (2016a). *Järjestöt julkisen kumppanista markkinoiden puristukseen: Sosiaali- ja terveysterveysten muutos sosiaalipalvelujen tuottajana vuosina 1990-2010* [NGOs: from public partnership to the mercy of the markets How the NGOs in social and health care changed as providers of social services in 1990–2010] [Doctoral dissertation, University of Lapland, Rovaniemi, Finland, Publisher: Ensi- ja turvakotienliitto, Helsinki, Finland.]. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/ensijaturvakotienliitto/docs/j_rjest_t_julkisen_kumppanista_ma
- Särkelä, R. (2016b, December 23). Järjestöjen osaamista ei ole varaa hukata. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://nakoislehti.hs.fi/501f483d-c95b-4eab-857f-bfc2e60c5e02/58>
- Selin, J., Hellman, M., & Lerkkanen, T. (2019). National Market Protectionist Gambling Policies in the European Union: The Finnish Gambling Monopoly Merger as a Case in Point. *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 41. <https://doi.org/10.4309/jgi.2019.41.8>
- Selle, P., & Strømsnes, K. (2019). The challenging position of civil society service production within the Norwegian welfare state. In S. Kuhnle, P. Selle, & S.E.O. Hort (Eds.), *Globalizing Welfare: An Evolving Asian-European Dialogue* (pp. 250–267). Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788975841.00024>
- Stenius, H. (2010). Nordic Associational Life in European and an Inter-Nordic Perspective. In Alapuro, R., & Stenius, H. (Eds.), *Nordic associations in a European perspective* (pp. 29–86). Baden-Baden: Nomos. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845225944>
- Sulkunen, P. (2018). The Public Interest Approach to Gambling Policy and Research. In M. Egerer, V. Marionneau, & J. Nikkinen (Eds.), *Gambling Policies in European Welfare States: Current Challenges and Future Prospects* (pp. 275–296). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/helsinki-ebooks/detail.action?docID=5438616>
- Sulkunen, P., Babor, T. F., Egerer, M., Hellman, M., Livingstone, C., Marionneau, V., Nikkinen, J., Room, R., Sulkunen, P., & Örnberg, J. C. (Eds.) (2018). *Setting limits: Gambling, science and public policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sutinen, T. (2014, December 3). Yksi monopoli voisi olla kolmea vahvempi. *Helsingin Sanomat*. Retrieved from <https://www.hs.fi/ilta/art-2000002782646.html>
- Törrönen, J. (2000). Mundane social policies in the context of the fragmentation of welfare-state-oriented alcohol policy in Finland. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 27(1), 137–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009145090002700106>
- Trägårdh, L. (2010). Rethinking the Nordic welfare state through a neo-Hegelian theory of state and civil society. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 15(3), 227–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2010.513853>
- Veikkaus Oy. (2019). *Lausuntopyyntö 19.12.2018. Hallituksen esitys arpajaislain ja rahanpesulain muuttamisesta (HE 213/2018 vp)*. Eduskunnan hallintovaliokunta. <https://www.eduskunta.fi/FI/vaski/JulkaisuMetatieto/Documents/EDK-2019-AK-235953.pdf>
- Zimmer, A., & Freise, M. (2008). Bringing society back in: Civil society, social capital and the third sector. In W. A. Maloney & J. W. van Deth (Eds.), *Civil Society and Governance in Europe: From National to International Linkages* (pp. 19–42). Cheltenham, Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781848442870.00010>